

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCI United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, Vigniss 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION
09/992,409	11/26/2001	Youngkyoo Kim	P63680US4	1937

7590

JACOBSON, PRICE, HOLMAN & STERN PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY 400 Seventh Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20004

10/01/2003

EXA	EXAMINER XU, LING X PAPER NUMBER
XU,	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1775	

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	$-\Pi$
•		09/992,409	KIM ET AL.	[]
`.,	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	11/
`		Ling X. Xu	1775	/'\
	The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence addr	ess
THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur - Any re earne	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION is communication of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by steply received by the Office later than three months after the moderate of the product of the pr	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thi nod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this com. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	munication.
itatus 1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	03 September 2003 .		
2a)□	•	This action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice un	owance except for formal ma	atters, prosecution as to the .D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	merits is
-	on of Claims			
•	Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application	*		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
· _	Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected.			
-	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
•	Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar on Papers	nd/or election requirement.		
9)□ 1	The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.		
10)∐ Т	Γhe drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ a	ccepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.	
•	Applicant may not request that any objection t			
11)□ T	The proposed drawing correction filed on		disapproved by the Examiner.	
_	If approved, corrected drawings are required in			
<i>,</i> —	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.		
_	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			
	1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received in A	Application No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International ee the attached detailed Office action for a	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		tage
14) 🗌 A	cknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	estic priority under 35 U.S.C	§ 119(e) (to a provisional a	pplication).
	☐ The translation of the foreign language scknowledgment is made of a claim for dom			
ttachment	(s)			
Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(5) Notice of	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). Informal Patent Application (PTO-	
Patent and Tra OL-326 (Re	ademark Office ev. 04-01) Offic	e Action Summary	Part of P	aper No. 4

Application/Control Number: 09/992,409

Art Unit: 1775

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 9/3/2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-4 under 35USC 102(b) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly found prior art references set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi (US 6,083,634) in view of Shi et al. (US 5,755,999).

Shi ('634) discloses a new class of organometallic complexes for use in EL devices. The organometallic complexes has the same ligand as the claimed formula (I) (Col. 4, lines 1-67).

With respect to claims 2-3, Shi discloses the organic emissive layer in the EL device is formed of at least one organometallic complex (Col. 4, lines 1-5).

Shi ('634) discloses M2 is divalent or trivalent metal. Shi does not disclose that the metal M2 can be monovalent or tetravalent.

Application/Control Number: 09/992,409

Art Unit: 1775

Shi ('999) teaches that organometallic complexes use in organic EL devices (Col. 34, lines 44-67). The metal used can be monovalent, divalent, or trivalent such as Li, Na, K (Col. 35, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute monovalent, trivalent metal or even tetravalent metal with divalent metal in Shi's ('634) organometallic complexes. Because these metals are conventionally employed in the art for metal chelated compounds, as also taught by Shi ('999). These metals complexes are similar compounds which contain the same ligand structure. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to substitute one for the other among these metals with expectation that similar compounds would have similar properties.

It is noted that claim 4 is a product-by-process claim. Product-by-process claims are not limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only the structure implied by the steps (MPEP 2113). "[E]ven though product – by process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, 966.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ling X. Xu whose telephone number is 703-305-0395. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:30 Monday - Friday.

Application/Control Number: 09/992,409

Art Unit: 1775

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah D. Jones can be reached on 703-308-3822. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Ling X. Xu Examiner Art Unit 1775

lx I V

DEBORAH JONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER